## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-7431

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

SOLOMON DUKES, JR., a/k/a Junior,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (CR-94-589, CA-99-1129)

\_\_\_\_

Submitted: April 29, 2003

Decided: May 15, 2003

Before LUTTIG and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Solomon Dukes, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Robert Hayden Bickerton, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

## PER CURIAM:

Solomon Dukes, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court on the merits absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The relevant inquiry is whether "'reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Miller-El v. Cockrell, 129 S. Ct. 1029, 1040 (2003) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Dukes has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED